

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This case has been carefully reviewed and analyzed, and reconsideration and favorable action is respectfully requested.

CLAIM REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. 102(b)

Claims 1-3 and 7-10 were originally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Weisman.

CLAIM REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims 4, 5, 11-15 and 17 were originally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weisman in view of Brown.

In addition, claims 1-3 and 6-10 were originally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Michel in view of Weisman.

However, the Examiner has pointed out that claim 16 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.


Responsive to this, claims 12, 13 and 16 are deleted, and claim 1 is amended which is substantially the combination of original claims 1, 12, 13 and 16 so as to make the claimed invention more distinguishably patentable over the prior art references cited by the Examiner.

Accordingly, by the amendments, it is believed that the rejections of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) and 103(a) should be withdrawn, and the amended claim 1 should be allowable.

It is further submitted that the amended claims 2-11, 14, 15 and 17 should be allowable as they are dependent upon the amended claim 1 which is believed to be allowable.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that the application is now in a condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,


Applicant

Chih-Ching Hsien

58, MA YUAN WEST ST.,

TAICHUNG, TAIWAN

Aug. 30, 2004